

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 2:23-cv-06283-SPG-KES
Title Celis-Capistrano v. Linga, et al.

Date April 23, 2025

Present: The Honorable SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

P. Gomez
Deputy Clerk

Not Reported
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:
Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:
Not Present

Proceeding: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED

This case was transferred to this Court on April 21, 2025. The Court takes notice that Plaintiff has not filed anything in this case since November 16, 2023. See (ECF No. 42). The Court also takes notice that on November 7, 2023, Plaintiff was sanctioned by Judge Anderson for failing to file a notice of related cases in this action, despite filing and then later dismissing an identical complaint in Case No. 2:23-cv-00843 (PD). See (ECF No. 39).

The Court enjoys the inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion. See, e.g., *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629 (1962) (“The authority of a federal trial court to dismiss a plaintiff’s action with prejudice because of his failure to prosecute cannot seriously be doubted.”). Consistent with that authority, the Court ORDERS Plaintiffs to show cause, in writing, on or before May 7, 2025, why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. This matter will stand submitted upon the filing of Plaintiffs’ response. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78. Failure to respond will be deemed consent to the dismissal of the action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer pg _____